



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





5

NEWMANIANISM

A PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION
OF PHILOMYTHUS

CONTAINING
A REPLY TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR"
A FEW WORDS TO MR. WILFRID WARD
AND SOME REMARKS ON MR. R. H. HUTTON'S
"CARDINAL NEWMAN"

BY
EDWIN A. ABBOTT

[The Author, having regard to the circumstances in which a controversy, provoked by the Editor of the "Spectator," was "closed" by the latter, invites the attention of the Press to the question; and places at the disposal of the Editors of any Periodicals, literary or otherwise, such portions as they may desire to reproduce in their columns.]

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK

1891

CORRIGENDA.

- P. 4, last line, for *quoting*, read *alleging*.
- P. 5, foot-note, last line but two, *dele* "rather," and for "tradition" read "*tradition (sic)*."
- P. 223, last line but six, *dele* inverted commas before "prominent."
- P. 229, last line but four, for "preface," read "extract."
- P. 240, lines six and foll., for *yes . . . it*, read *no, not "carefully," unless the word could apply to the unconscious care and instinctive caution of a born rhetorician.*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 1. <i>The Motive of the Author</i>	v
§ 2. <i>The Criticism of the "Spectator"</i>	vii
§ 3. <i>The Editor of the "Spectator"</i>	x
§ 4. <i>Mr. Ward's Charge of "unmannerly abuse"</i>	xv
§ 5. <i>Mr. Ward's Charge of "direct misrepresentation"</i>	xviii
§ 6. <i>Mr. Ward's "Hopes"</i>	xxii
§ 7. <i>The "Spectator's" Arithmetic</i>	xxvii
§ 8. <i>An Appeal from the Editor of the "Spectator" to Mr. R. H. Hutton</i>	xxxiv
§ 9. <i>Mr. R. H. Hutton's "Cardinal Newman"</i>	xxxvii
§ 10. <i>The Kingsleyan Controversy</i>	xlii
§ 11. <i>Mr. Hutton not much to blame</i>	lii
§ 12. <i>Polemical Theology</i>	lviii
§ 13. <i>The Origin of this Book</i>	lxii
—	
P.S. § 14. <i>Mr. R. H. Hutton very much to blame</i>	lxix

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

§ 1. *The Motive of the Author*

THIS book was originally meant to be a chapter in a larger work on Newman; and the intention was to compress into it most of the severe things which, in common honesty, it seemed needful to say about Newman's use of words and evidence in controversy, so as to leave freedom for a more sympathetic treatment of the subject as a whole in the rest of the work.

But, on investigation, the grounds for censure appeared much larger than I had anticipated; and, when I came to study the *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*, the mental and almost moral shock which I received from that portentous work—and from the amazing fact that it had been thought well to reprint such a production in the year 1890—caused my single chapter to grow first into several chapters and ultimately into a separate volume.

My book is intended as an attack, not against Newman himself, but against the whole of that theological “system

B

of safety" which would pollute the intellect with the suggestion that it is "safe" to say this, and "unsafe" to say that, about alleged historical facts. In answer to someone who had reported a saying that Cardinal (then Dr.) Wiseman "was an unscrupulous controversialist," Newman replied (*Letters* ii. 324) "I daresay he is. But who is not?" How strange an avowal, almost amounting to a condonation! And yet, is it not true? Is it not a fact—though a portentous fact—that men are expected to argue with scrupulous honesty about Thucydides or Aristotle, but not about the facts of the Bible or the history of the Christian Church? My war, then, is not with Newman, but with the system which Newman in these words (perhaps unconsciously) condemns.

Such letters as I have received already (within little more than a fortnight from the date of publication), from eminent men well fitted to weigh evidence and to discuss the special questions here treated, lead me to hope that my book is not only substantially accurate but also helpful to the cause of religious truth. But it was of course impossible to attempt to dispel that kind of legendary exaggeration which had gradually attached itself to the popular estimate of Newman's work, without giving pain to some of his admirers.

When a man of such high intellectual standing as Mr. R. H. Hutton, could quote passage after passage from Newman's works—passages teeming with fallacies or with expressions leading to erroneous conclusions—with an approval which, when combined with the intrinsic plausibility of the quota-

tions, imposes upon multitudes of readers (among whom the present writer must confess that he was, at first, one); and when so able a critic could bring himself to use the words "sobriety" and "discrimination" in connection with one of Newman's so-called "inquiries" into an alleged ecclesiastical miracle, it seemed clear that something must be done, and no less clear that nothing useful could be done without giving offence to some whom one was very loath to offend, but who were so blinded by Newman's magnetic influence that, in criticizing his works, they had lost all power of distinguishing truth from untruth.

§ 2. *The Criticism of the "Spectator"*

Hitherto, however, among many criticisms from the press, the Editor of the *Spectator* has been unique in accusing me of "unfairness"; and I trust—having regard to the good fame of British journalism—that he will remain unique in having accused me of *insincerity*. The latter accusation has indeed been withdrawn, but in so grudging a spirit as to make the recantation almost worse than the original offence: "*We suppose we had no right to say*"—here, as elsewhere, the italics are mine—"that we did not believe him to be quite sincere in denying that Newman was guilty of conscious insincerity, and we withdraw the statement" (*Spectator*, 25th April, 1891).

The accusations of "unfairness" are not withdrawn. But their insignificance may be estimated from a single specimen.

The Editor accused me of ignoring the fact that "*at the time these Essays were published*" (meaning Newman's two Essays on miracles) there was not "*any of the ground*" which exists now for attributing cures to "faith-healing." In my reply I showed, first, that in the expression italicized above he had *confused together* (and this, not once, but thrice) two quite distinct Essays, of which one was published by Newman as a Protestant, and the other about sixteen or seventeen years afterwards when he was on the verge of Romanism: I then showed that, even in the earlier Essay, Newman definitely recognized some so-called miraculous cures "*as possible effects of an excited imagination;*" I added that *a fortiori*, with the growth of science, sixteen or seventeen years afterwards, there would be still more of that "ground" of which the very existence had been denied by my censor, and I invited him to reconsider his charge of "unfairness." But it remains unwithdrawn. That being the case, it seems well to place upon record this instance of the degree to which a critic of some repute may be biassed by what he has himself described as "five-and-twenty years' study of Newman."

I *could* not sincerely call Newman dishonest or deliberately insincere. It would appear, to me at all events, a gross psychological blunder—intellectually, as well as morally, offensive.¹ That subtlety and tortuosity of mind which

¹ On the same grounds on which the *Spectator* charged me with insincerity, they might impute insincerity to Coleridge, who, in his lectures on Shakespeare, maintains that Hamlet is deceiving himself, and

induced James Mozley to call Laud "great but *twisty*," is still more decidedly and justly to be distinguished from conscious insincerity in a nature like Newman's, which in many departments of thought evinced a singular simplicity and a hatred of things hollow and conventional. But still, the instincts of a theological rhetorician, striving for the truths which he supposes necessary for eternal salvation, do occasionally lead him to omit, pervert, distort, suppress, in a manner so extraordinary that any geologist, or astronomer, or philologist, or commentator (upon anything except the Bible) guilty of such desecrations of truth would receive the severest reprobation. Hence it is not always easy, while

unconsciously saying what is not true when he protests that his only reason for delaying to kill his uncle at his prayers is the fear lest thereby he should send the man to heaven.

I go with Coleridge, and think those who differ from Coleridge to be (from a Shakespearian point of view) fools; but I do not either call or think them knaves; and I should expect them neither to call nor to think me a knave.

So, in this Newmanian question, I ask for the same treatment that I would extend to others. After a most careful study of Newman based upon the Tractarian literature generally—and especially upon Newman's own letters, of which, till recently, the world has known very little—I have deliberately come to the conclusion that Newman says many things which in an ordinary man would argue insincerity, but do not argue insincerity in *him*. I say he is, like Hamlet, not a deceiver of others except so far as he is a pre-eminent deceiver of himself. I may be wrong: but it is monstrous, first to call me "not quite sincere," and then to withdraw nothing but the "right" to "*say*" so (clearly reserving the "right" still to *think* so)—simply because I have come to certain intellectual conclusions differing from those of the Editor of the *Spectator*.

Is it not just within the limits of possibility that, for once, a human being should be right, and the Editor of the *Spectator* wrong?

execrating the system, to speak mildly about an eminent man who is but one of many victims to it. One or two softening modifications I have already inserted in the "Corrigenda" of this edition, and, if an opportunity should present itself, I would gladly incorporate them hereafter in the text, together with any other corrections that may be shown to be demanded by justice.

§ 3. *The Editor of the "Spectator"*

Since the above was in print, incidents have occurred which have compelled me to amplify my Preface.

The additions will be, I am sorry to say, largely of a personal nature, and I shall give my adversaries a splendid chance of bespattering me with accusations of an egotism to which they themselves have driven me. But I will risk that. Better to bear such charges from a few Newmanians who are too angry to know what they are saying, than to encourage, by silence, a suspicion in ordinary readers that I have waited for the death of an eminent man in order to attack him with impunity.

In the course of my remarks I shall have to attack Mr. R. H. Hutton. I do it with regret; but he has forced me to it. Hitherto I have studiously avoided giving him pain. In *Philomythus* I have analysed passage after passage from Newman's works, and have exposed their errors and fallacies. These passages, in a great number of in-

stances, I had found in Mr. Hutton's *Cardinal Newman* quoted with expressed, or implied, approval. It was open to me (and I sometimes doubted whether it was not incumbent on me) to conclude each exposure with a moral—saying in effect, “See what Newmanianism brings a man to ! And this, too, not a fool, but a really able man ! Mark, and beware, the results of *five and twenty years' study of Newman !* !”

But I did nothing of the kind. In almost every instance I simply acknowledged Mr. Hutton's volume as the source of my extract. I left him alone, where Truth itself almost dictated that I should give him at least a passing touch. I sought peace and ensued it (so far as Mr. Hutton is concerned) ; but he prefers war ; and—since, under the present circumstances, war against Mr. Hutton appears likely to be the best mode of waging war for Truth—war let it be. But it shall be real war ; fighting, not cudgelling. Instead of bludgeoning him with epithets, I will do my best to catch him in the meshes of his own statements, and run him through with finely-pointed facts. It shall also be fair war. I shall convict him of a great many blunders, and of a continuous (though unintentional) misrepresentation of the object of his idolatry. But I shall never anger him, or disgrace myself, by denying that he is perfectly, blindly, and almost insanely “sincere.”

Besides being fair, the war shall also be, if possible, brief. If I might, without presumption, slightly change my metaphor for the purpose of what is to follow, I would

compare this Preface to one of those "Trophies" erected by Greek conquerors on the field of battle. The rule was, with the Greeks, that a "Trophy" should be erected in memory of a victory; but it was not to be repaired; it was allowed to tumble to pieces under the finger of that kind old peace-maker, Time. So will it be, I trust, with the "Trophy" which I am going to erect in the following paragraphs over the Editor of the *Spectator*, and Mr. Hutton. This Preface shall be—so far as I am concerned—ephemeral. If *Philomythus* comes to a third edition, I hope to cancel it should the conduct of others allow me to do so.

And now I must briefly explain what has occurred to necessitate this unusual proceeding. The Editor of the *Spectator* began by attacking me in an article, in which, after describing *Philomythus* as a specimen of "theological caning," "schoolmasterish severity," and "a superfluity of naughtiness of which only a pedantic theorist could be guilty," he proceeded to accuse me of four definite acts of unfairness (besides indefinite unfairnesses without number); then to imply that I was a Pharisee by saying, "Dr. Abbott evidently *does not think the worse of himself* for taking *all possible credit for formally* acquitting Newman;" and finally to bring against me (in the words above quoted) an approximation to a charge of *falsehood*.

In answer to a letter covering so much ground, I was necessarily obliged to write a long and somewhat technical reply, in which I convicted him of manifold errors and definitely met his charges of "unfairness," leaving my

“sincerity”—as I suppose most men of honour would have done in such a case—to take care of itself.

The Editor inserted my letter. But he prefixed to it a second article of his own, declining to criticize “a petty verbal assault”; pouring contempt upon me, apparently because I am not, as Newman was, “two or three selves at once in the wonderful structure of” my “mind;” and pronouncing my book to be “singularly deficient in candour” on the very same page in which he vouchsafed to “*suppose*” that he “had no right” to accuse me of insincerity. He aggravated this offence by speaking of my “upright and manly life.” I do not mind, so much, a stranger’s calling me insincere: but I object more strongly to it from one who professes (I do not know on what grounds) to know enough about me to testify to my “uprightness.” He also used a great deal of loose and inaccurate, though interesting and plausible, language about Newman, which—though it would only convince the thoughtful and well-informed reader that the Editor was blind to almost all Newman’s defects—would suggest, to the ill-informed, that I was blind to all Newman’s virtues.

Besides this second article, he inserted a letter from Mr. Wilfrid Ward, accusing me (1) of “unmannerly abuse,” (2) of “direct misrepresentation,” (3) of “attempting to establish a case by misleading treatment,” (4) of “*electing*,” not only to omit Newman’s italics in a quotation, but also to *insert a word of my own*—an accusation which, of course, though it may suggest nothing of any importance to some

classes of people, yet, coming from one who is a man of honour as well as a man of letters, amounted to a charge of something approximating to *knavery*.

Lastly, the Editor appended to my letter a long comment of his own, withdrawing nothing, correcting nothing except a date that he "carelessly wrote from memory," and mystifying and confusing everything.

To all these charges it was difficult to make a short reply ; but I made it, at all events, a great deal shorter than my first letter, and sent it to the Editor. It was returned unprinted, with a note from Mr. R. H. Hutton, alleging that my first letter had already occupied *more space than the attacks against me*, "including the two articles." He curtly added that he would give me "a column at most," but that it was "simply impossible to *fill another Spectator with a fresh reply*." This was slightly discourteous. But I was not surprised at that ; for I had expected it. A little irritation was not very unnatural, and was quite pardonable in one whom I had (unintentionally) pained a great deal. What surprised me was that he should be so very angry as to be blind to the fact that *less than four* columns (the length of my letter) cannot be called, on the ordinary principles of Arithmetic, *more than seven* (the length of the attacks on me) or even *more than five* (the length of his two articles).

I felt that his anger must be great indeed to produce such results as these. And other considerations reconciled me to this little ebullition of Editorial abruptness.

I knew that many constant readers of the *Spectator* had for many years shaken their heads mournfully over the growing tendency to narrow views in one who had once been supposed to feel a genuine admiration for Mr. F. D. Maurice ; I knew how bitterly the late Bishop of Manchester had felt the constant worrying with which he had been harassed by the *Spectator* in his declining years for honestly attempting to enforce among his clergy an observance of the law ; I knew how, quite recently, the *Spectator* had persistently refrained, as long as it was possible to do so, from making any comment whatever on the "Service of Reconciliation, or Act of Reparation to Almighty God for the dishonour recently done to His sanctuary" by the act of a lunatic who shed his blood within the walls of St. Paul's ; and further, I knew that, though the *Times* had thrown open its columns to a discussion of the subject, the *Spectator* had refused to insert a letter written by the foremost disciple of Mr. F. D. Maurice, a clergyman to whose opinion few, if any, of our bishops would have denied a profound and respectful attention. This being the case, there did not seem much for me to complain of.

So I sat down to condense my letter into "one column." Here it is, as it was printed, except that I have added, in brackets, two words for clearness.

§ 4. *Mr. Ward's Charge of "unmannerly abuse"*

"SIR,—You wish to close 'our unwelcome controversy'—which you yourself provoked by charging me with un-

fairness and insincerity—having made a second attack on me in which you leave the charges of unfairness unwithdrawn (as to some of which—*e.g.*, that about ‘faith-healing’—even you, I should have thought, would have confessed yourself to have been in the wrong), and the charge of insincerity withdrawn in such terms as to aggravate the offence.¹

“I sent you a reply to Mr. Ward’s charges (1) of ‘direct misrepresentation,’ (2) of ‘unmannerly abuse;’ and you returned it, restricting me to a column. Cancelling, therefore, all that section of my letter which refers to ‘direct misrepresentation,’ I ask scholars to believe me for the present (as being unheard) to be innocent of this offence, promising to publish the suppressed section at an early opportunity. I have only space to deal with the charge of ‘unmannerly abuse,’ under which Mr. Ward complains that I apply to Newman the words (1) ‘slatternly,’ (2) ‘insolent aggressiveness,’ (3) ‘conduct worthy of a bookseller’s hack.’

“(1.) I called parts of Newman’s essay (not Newman) ‘slatternly.’ Whoever denies this, has either not read the essay, or his scholarship is beneath contempt. I adhere to this.

“(2.) The words ‘*just a spice of insolent aggressiveness*’ described the occasional abruptness and provocativeness of

¹ “We *suppose we had no right to say* that we did not believe him to be quite sincere . . . and we withdraw the statement.” Here, as elsewhere, the italics are mine.

Newman's style, which Newman himself described as 'a blow in the face,' and Froude as 'a blow in the stomach.' Similarly, Dean Church described Mr. W. G. Ward's style as 'intolerably provoking,' and 'unreservedly *defiant and aggressive.*' The words '*just a spice of*' ought not to have been omitted [by Mr. Ward]. I adhere to this.

"(3.) Who could suppose from Mr. Ward's quotation that I *expressly denied* that Newman was a 'hack'? A 'hack' is one who stoops to inferior literary work for gain. Newman, in his essay, stooped to inferior work, but *not* for gain. This my words clearly showed :—'Newman could not have thus degraded his pen for a bribe of any material kind.'¹ I adhere to this.

"So much for *my* 'unmannerly abuse.' But what has Mr. Ward to say about his (what shall I call it?) use of language? I pass over such phrases as 'gross instances of attempting to establish a case by misleading treatment;' but no amount of charity will enable me to pass over the charge of '*electing*' to *interpolate a word of my own in a quotation from Newman.* And this, too, in a quotation which I had given correctly on another page! Every

¹ The editorial restriction, obliging me to be brief, made me perhaps obscure. But an illustration will make my meaning clear. If I say about a statesman, for example, "His conduct on this occasion was worthy of a madman, *but we know well that he was one of the most clear-headed men of his time*"—do I accuse him of madness? Do I not rather clearly deny that he was a madman? So here: "Such conduct is worthy of a bookseller's hack, not of one who aspires to be called a theologian. *But we know well that Newman was absolutely indifferent to pecuniary considerations,* and could not thus have degraded," &c.

man of letters knows that to impute this is to impute something approximating to knavery. In 1864 Newman wrote :—‘I do not like to be called to my face a *liar* and a *knave*.’ The tables are turned. In 1891, similar terms are reserved for one who ventures to point out Newman’s intellectual failings, forced to this thankless task by what he conceived to be a moral obligation. I have already received from the editor of the *Spectator* a withdrawal of the charge of an approximation to lying; I have now to ask Mr. Ward to withdraw the charge of an approximation to knavery. All your readers will agree that the latter charge ought not to have been written; some may think that, when written, it ought not to have been printed.

“Cannot Newman’s best friends see that they are playing into the hands of his worst enemies (of whom assuredly I am not one) when they—imbued with his works, and supposed to be imbued with his spirit—defend him in this way ?—I am, Sir, &c.”

§ 5. *Mr. Ward’s Charge of “direct misrepresentation”*

The reader will perceive from this letter that I pledged myself to publish, at an early opportunity, my suppressed refutation of Mr. Ward’s charge of “direct misrepresentation.” I now proceed to do so: but I warn the ordinary reader not to spend much time over it. It is necessarily

technical, and I was obliged to be brief, and therefore to risk a little obscurity. Good scholars, I think, will see at a glance that Mr. Ward, if either of us, has (of course unintentionally) misrepresented the facts ; but those who are not conversant with Eusebius may find a little difficulty in following the argument. However, here it is :—

“ * * * * * I turn to Mr. Ward, who accuses me (1) of ‘direct misrepresentation,’ (2) of ‘unmannerly abuse.’

“First for the ‘direct misrepresentation.’ After quoting a passage from *Philomythus*, Mr. Ward says, ‘I naturally supposed from this, as other readers will have done, that Newman had *narrated as positive statements of Eusebius what that historian gives as reports*’ ; and he tries to show that this was *not* the case. I will prove that it *is* the case.

“1. I lay little stress on the first case because Mr. Ward himself admits it. In the story of the Thundering Legion, Newman has omitted the words of Eusebius ‘it is reported,’ coming before an account of some wonderful descent of thunderbolts. But Mr. Ward extenuates the omission on the ground that in a previous sentence Newman had translated the phrase. He seems to write as though I had suppressed this fact : but here are my words, ‘Newman omits the *second* “it is reported that.”’ And he seems to be hardly aware, 1st, that a Greek historian would not be likely to *repeat* a phrase of this kind unless he desired to emphasise it in a manner by no means expressed to English

readers in Mr. Ward's translation ;¹ 2nd, that Newman himself is led by this omission to *misrepresent Eusebius* (unintentionally, of course) *a second time*, as will appear in the next paragraph.

" 2. Newman says, 'Apollinaris, Tertullian, and Eusebius, attest &c.' Here we see the results of the previous careless misrepresentation. Eusebius 'attests' absolutely nothing. He quotes Apollinaris, he quotes Tertullian, and he quotes 'report.' But he expressly shifts from himself the responsibility of 'attesting' anything whatever, by these final words: 'But about these matters *let each of my readers decide as he pleases.*' These words Newman ignores, and, by² omitting the words, 'it is reported,' he makes Eusebius 'attest' what he does *not* 'attest.'

" 3. Eusebius tells a story about a thaumaturgic conversion of water into oil by St. Narcissus, apparently expressing his disbelief in it by inserting, or implying, before each clause, 'they say that,' e.g., '(*They say that*) a small specimen' of the oil 'was preserved.' Newman says, 'Eusebius, *who relates this miracle*, says that small quantities of the oil *were preserved* even to his time.'

" Here Eusebius is made to 'say' what he does *not* 'say.' And further the reader is led to suppose that, if Eusebius 'said' this, he must have believed in the miracle, and that

¹ If I were at liberty to alter the text, I should insert before "translation", the words—"not very satisfactory, though, for his purposes, effective."

² The word "by" should have been omitted.

therefore he 'relates this miracle' on his own responsibility; which is *not the fact*.

"4. Immediately after this miraculous story Eusebius tells a non-miraculous story about the same Saint. He makes a marked distinction between the two. The former he tells throughout with the incredulous '*they say that*'; the latter he relates in the indicative mood as a *historical fact*; the former he describes as a thaumaturgic act (*θαύμα*) 'mentioned, *as if from tradition, ὡσάν* (Newman reads *ὡς*) *ἐκ παραδόσεως,*' the latter he classifies under '*things worthy of mention enumerated (or stated)*' by members of the Church of Jerusalem.

"Newman absolutely ignores this distinction, and classes *both* stories as *one*, under 'tradition.' 'Eusebius,' he says, 'notices pointedly that *it*¹ was the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem.'" I say that Newman was wrong in ignoring this distinction; Mr. Ward says he was right. I am content to leave it so.

"As regards the three instances first quoted, I am quite sure that scholars would maintain that Newman *has* 'narrated as positive statements of Eusebius what the historian gives as reports.' As regards the fourth, what I asserted was that Newman 'ignored the marked distinction made by the historian :' and I might have added that, in consequence of his ignoring this distinction, he (unintentionally, of course) makes Eusebius say what he did not say, viz., that the miraculous oil *was* preserved. Mr. Ward, however, sees

¹ "It," *i.e.* the *two* stories. Newman italicizes "tradition."

no 'marked distinction,' but only a 'difference in the form of expression.' I can simply marvel and pass on.

"5. There remains one small point which Mr. Ward has made a large one in his treatment of it. In a quotation from Newman on p. 5 (given by me correctly on p. 157), I have carelessly inserted the word 'rather,' an act of sheer and unmitigated carelessness, for which Mr. Ward would have been perfectly justified in censuring me.

"But he has done more than censure me. He has said that I have '*elect*ed,' not only to omit Newman's italics in this quotation, but also to '*insert*' *this word of my own*. Now as regards the italics, I have given a general notice (*Philomythus*, p. 9, note) that in all quotations italics are mine, not Newman's; once at least I have retained his italics and called attention to them in a foot-note; but here (since a footnote on a foot-note was out of the question) I did not retain them.¹ But the charge of '*electing*' to *insert a word of one's own in a quotation from an opponent* stands on a very different footing * * * " and then follows, rather more fully stated, the substance of the letter given above; which I will not repeat.

§ 6. Mr. Ward's "Hopes"

The reader will have perceived that Mr. Ward, in his letter, hopes "to have an opportunity of pointing out" my

¹ In my second edition, I have got over the difficulty by appending *sic* to denote that the italics are here exceptional—not mine, but Newman's.

“misstatements at some length.” He will not easily believe how much pleasure these words, at first, gave me ; but I will try to make him understand that it was so, and why it was so.

He calls me “this scrupulous advocate of accuracy ;” which I am. But he evidently thinks that I take credit to myself for being a model of accuracy ; which I do not. On the contrary, I have always avowed myself to be, *by nature*, one of the most inaccurate of mankind ; and, although I have set myself, from my youth upward, to conquer this defect, I know it is far from eradicated.

Conscious of this grave fault, and knowing that, however careful I might be, I must perforce give a good deal of pain to some of Newman’s too blind admirers, I submitted the proofs of *Philomythus* to several competent judges (whose kind help I should have acknowledged in my Preface to the First Edition but for the odium which, I knew, would attach to the result) ; and I gave special weight to those who were most in sympathy with Newman. Unfortunately, one devoted admirer of Newman, a member of the Church of Rome, from whose censorship I had hoped most of all, felt precluded, on religious grounds, from helping me to make my book more accurate, and therefore more efficient. When therefore I read Mr. Ward’s expression of his “hope” at the beginning of his letter, I felt at first a thrill of the most genuine delight : “Here,” said I, “is the very man I want, a real *bona fide* advocate of Newman.” Alas ! my delight soon turned

to bitter disappointment. The further I read, the lower my hopes fell. I was not surprised or disappointed at his being angry. "Ludicrous," "unmannerly," "violent," "abuse," "falsely represents"—of course Mr. Ward *meant* to supply, and I *did* supply, mentally, for him, the word "unintentionally"—all these things did not much move me. In a sense they almost pleased me. For, at least, they clearly showed that he was in earnest, and that he would do his best for the great Cardinal. And, since I could not have the Cardinal himself, this was what I wanted—a genuine champion. But my dejection arose from other causes. It was gradually borne in upon me that Mr. Ward gave at present few or no signs of being an adequate scholar; and, as to evidence, his sole faculty seemed to be that of misappreciating and deranging it in such a way as to mystify and confuse both himself and his readers.

Besides, of course, there was that other charge of "*electing*" to insert a word of my own in a quotation from Newman, which, I must honestly confess, *did* make me angry. And it annoyed me, too, by suggesting the inference that, although Mr. Ward would, no doubt, frankly express his regret for this unintentional slip, yet still, if he was going to repeat such slips as these when he pointed out my misstatements "at some length," I should be compelled by self-respect to decline controversy with him; and so I should lose the very useful stimulus and friction of mind with mind, and should be obliged to leave Mr. Ward master

of the field in the eyes of a certain portion of the public who could not see through his honest fallacies and bewildering (though unintentional) misrepresentations.

This being the case, it has occurred to me that I may do something to prevent him from making slips of that kind for the future. As therefore Mr. Ward has communicated to the public his "*hope*," so I will venture to communicate to them, and to him, my *intention*.

If he indicates real and serious errors either of fact or logic, and steers clear of non-literary personalities, I will answer him ; taking my time to weigh whatever may deserve time ; acknowledging, and (so far as I can, in the larger works which I am preparing) rectifying whatever may be wrong ; and vindicating what is right. But if he repeats his previous language, I shall be forced to take it as a proof that he does not understand English ; or that he has not received an English education ; or at all events that he is disqualified by some cause, known or unknown, from being an antagonist with whom I can hold a literary discussion.

The reader (and perhaps Mr. Ward himself) will now perceive that Mr. Ward's "hopes" are my hopes. I earnestly trust that he may find the opportunity he desires. And, in order that he may be as useful to me as he can, I wish to prepare him for his task by giving him some advice.

I want him to gird himself up for a great task. Let him remember that it is not enough to detect me in a false reference here, or a word wrongly inserted there ; to point out a trifling misstatement on one page or an

exaggeration on another; or to take a bitter phrase or pungent saying *out of its context*, and put it before the public—omitting, say, some adverb or some modifying phrase, or qualifying statement, and crying, “See, what *unmannerly abuse!*” All this is, comparatively speaking, nothing. At all events it will not be worthy of my notice. Let him take Newman’s first “principle” and maintain that; or let him take Newman’s inquiry into the miracle of, say, the blind man in Milan and justify that; then I shall own him to be an opponent worthy of an answer. I think he will find the task as much beyond his powers as to uproot Ossa and pile it upon Pelion; but if he tries it, the assault will be at all events worthy of a serious attempt to repel it. If he does not try it, but confines himself to small details only worthy to be acknowledged in my *Corrigenda*, he must not be surprised if I meet him with silence.

Since the printing of what has preceded, Mr. Ward’s reply has appeared in the *Spectator*.

Misquoting a passage of mine, and putting into my mouth language which I had carefully avoided because it would have accused Newman of simple knavery, Mr. Ward finds it “almost amusing” that I, who (as he thinks) impute knavery to Newman, should construe so seriously the charge of “*electing*” to interpolate a word of my own in a quotation from an opponent. “However,” he con-

tinues, "if the expression conveys so much to him, I am happy to withdraw it."

I take note of the withdrawal. But I cannot think the omen favourable for a continuance of literary controversy between us. It ought to be needless to assure any man of letters that such a charge as this *does* "convey much," and, indeed, very much, meaning. Nor do I quite understand how a faithful disciple of Newman's, while retaining the belief that I accuse his Master of knavery, can feel "happy" to acquit me of a similar charge.

§ 7. *The "Spectator's" Arithmetic*

1. In the recent discussion in the *Spectator* the Editor makes a frank confession, "We carelessly wrote from memory 1842 instead of 1840." Well, that *was* careless. But, being portentously careless myself, I do not wish to be hard upon others. This, however, was more than a mere slip of ordinary carelessness, as the following words show: "Now this is a case in which Dr. Abbott knows the result. The result was, to delay by just *a year, or a year and a half, and no more*, the resignation of the living." The result was nothing of the kind. The result was to delay the resignation for *three years*. A mere careless slip of 1842 for 1840 is one thing: an inference based on that careless slip is a repetition of the carelessness which implies a want of familiarity with some of the most critical events of Newman's life.

2. I pointed out above that the Editor has confused

together two of Newman's Essays, one of which was written during his Protestant life in 1826; the other, written during his transition stage in 1842, was published, as an Essay, in 1843. He has repeatedly used language indicating that he believed *both* to have been published—and in one case he says "*written*"—in 1842.

Now upon this error of his own he bases an attack of "unfairness" against me. "Why," he practically asks me— if I may put his question in my own words—"were you so unfair as to accuse Newman of ignoring the effect of the imagination in working quasi-miraculous cures *at the time these essays were written* (1842), when, *even so late as the time at which Newman's "Apologia" was composed* (1864), the very thought of such a thing had never come into any one's head?"

Then the Editor added a sentence which to this day I cannot make out; but I believe it is dictated by a peculiar and Newmanian method of counting: I had no space to expose it (or several other errors besides) in my reply to the *Spectator*: but I will expose it now:—

"*Twenty-five* years ago, and, still more *thirty-eight* years ago, the notion that the stigmata, for instance, could be produced on the skin by mere emotional expectation of them, would have been ridiculed by physiologists, as absurd in the highest degree."

Perhaps. But what, in the name of ordinary arithmetic, have these figures to do with the question? *What was it that happened* "twenty-five years" ago? I really do not

know : $1891 - 25 = 1866$; and I do not know what particular incident, to the purpose, happened in 1866. Can it be that he mean this for 'the time at which Newman's *Apologia* was composed,' *i.e.*, 1864 ?

Again, *what happened* "thirty-eight" years ago, what, at least, that is in any way to the point ? Repeating the process of subtraction, we find that $1891 - 38 = 1853$: but *what happened* then ? I have not the least glimmering of a conception. Here again I can only conjecture that he meant 1843, "the time when *these essays* were written," and that the result is to be explained by the peculiarities of Newmanian subtraction !

Now, after this digression, let the reader note my argument and judge whether it does not completely meet the charge of "unfairness." It was as follows:—

"You imply that *at the time Newman wrote his essay in 1842* (I will not press you further as to your blunder about 'the time when *these essays* were written,' but accept your own explanation, *viz.*, that you were thinking only of the *second Essay*) *there was 'not any' of the present ground for attributing cures to faith-healing.*

"I prove to you, by a quotation from the *Essay of 1826*, that Newman *did definitely recognize such a ground as early as 1826*, and I urge that, if he does not mention it in 1843, it was because he thought less of it, *not because he was ignorant of it.*

"What do you say to that ? And will you withdraw your charge of unfairness ?"

But the Editor says nothing,¹ and withdraws nothing ; and the charitable inference is that he sees nothing.

3. The Editor asserts that Newman, in 1843, did not *really believe* in any of the nine great historical miracles which he selected for particular inquiry, except the miraculous frustration of Julian's endeavour to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, and *one* other.

In answer to this, I quoted a passage in which Newman, insisting that *three* of the nine were wrought in the teeth of the rulers of their respective localities, continues as follows : " Surely, if there are miracles *prominent above others* in these times, in that number are *the three* which I have just specified ; *they are great in themselves and in their fame.*"

How does the Editor answer this? Why, by quoting a mystifying passage about the death of Arius (one of the three miracles above mentioned) in which Newman says that " the question is . . . whether it is an event the like of which persons who deny that miracles continue will consent that the Church should be considered still able to perform."

Why not have quoted the *very next sentence*, which is not mystifying at all, but transparently clear—" However, that it was *really miraculous*, Gibbon surely is a sufficient voucher"? Or why not have quoted Newman's preceding remark : " But after all, was it a miracle? For *if not*,

¹ Since these words were in print, the Editor *has* said something : " Our opinion as to Dr. Abbott's unfairness *has not been in the slightest degree modified by his reply.*"

we are *labouring at a proof of which nothing comes*?—to which Newman replies, after summarizing the facts, “Is it not trifling to ask *whether such* an occurrence comes up to the definition of a miracle?” Surely, grammar and context and common sense show that this means, “It *does* come up to the definition of a miracle and it is *trifling* to deny it.”

What then are the facts? Newman calls the death of Arius one of three miracles “*prominent above others*,” “*great in themselves and in their fame*”; he implies that it is mere “trifling” to deny that it *comes up to the definition of a miracle*; he alleges a “voucher” to show that it “was *really* miraculous”; and yet the *Spectator*, after having accused me of “unfairness” because I differed from them on this point, has the hardihood to persist: “We *do not admit* that Dr. Newman did think the death of Arius *certainly* miraculous.”

4. I added that in 1843—“*at the time when these essays were written*,” as the *Spectator* had asserted—Newman believed in the miracle of the Tongueless Martyrs.

How does the Editor answer this? Thus: “Dr. Newman gave that up as a test case, not only before the essay WAS REPUBLISHED in 1870, but before the appendix to the *Apologia* was written [*i.e.*, 1865].” Now once more, in the name of correct dates and common-place non-Newmanian arithmetic, what on earth has this to do with the question? The Editor implied that in *the year* 1842-3, Newman did not believe in this miracle; I showed,

from the essay of 1842-3, that, on the contrary, he thought it *at that time* one of the strongest of his miracles. And yet the *Spectator* actually thinks it worth while to reply, "Oh, but at all events he gave it up in 1870, and even before 1865." The point is 1842-3, and nothing else.

Taken altogether, these mistakes of dates (to which I shall presently add others) and of small arithmetical calculations, viz. (a) 1842 for 1840; leading to (b) "a year, or a year and a half and no more," for "three years"; (c) 25 for 27; (d) 38, apparently meant for 48—and all these in an assault upon one whom he repeatedly accuses of "unfairness" because he himself is ignorant of the accurate use of numbers—do they not point to the conclusion that Mr. Hutton's above-mentioned extraordinary mistake of asserting that 4 is more than 7, or at all events more than 5, was not a solitary or exceptional lapse, but one among many results of that Newmanian confusion which seems to infect all attempts at exact thought?

5. I quoted Newman's own words to the effect that no one "*in office* in the English Church, whether Bishop or Incumbent, could be *otherwise than in hostility to the Church of Rome.*" This was, in Newman's words, his belief "*all along,*" *i.e.*, throughout his Anglican career. I then showed that, in 1840, Newman was *not*, and avowed he was *not*, "in hostility to the Church of Rome." And then I tried to show how, by a process of "lubrication," Newman contrived to persuade himself that he *might* do what he at the same time felt no one *could* do. He re-

mained Vicar of St. Mary's, *i.e.*, "*in office* in the English Church," although he felt, and avowed, that he was *not* "in hostility to the Church of Rome." That is, he did what, by his own confession, "no one" (*and therefore not he himself*) "could" do, *i.e.*, *ought to do*.

How did the Editor answer this? Simply by placing before the reader a long letter from Newman to Keble, in which the former, though he reveals something of his feelings, is far from being as frank with him as with his friend Rogers, who had told Newman, *a year before*, that, if his feelings continued, *he ought to resign St. Mary's*. But even if Newman had been ever so frank, that was *not the point*. The question was this and nothing else, *How did Newman persuade himself that he might do what he had "all along felt" no one "could," or, in plain English ought to, do*. I say it was by "lubrication." the Editor says nothing in particular.

6. The Editor expressed his opinion that Newman was a quite exceptionally original theologian. I pointed out that a good many of the original things attributed to Newman really came from Hurrell Froude, and that Newman himself acknowledged this.

I gave an instance. I said that the *Spectator* had recently printed under the title "A Remarkable Forecast of Cardinal Newman," a letter from a correspondent (sneering, by the way, at Archdeacon Farrar because the point had escaped the Archdeacon's "omnivorous" research) the purport of which was that religion would never be revived

in great towns by the married clergy alone, without the co-operation of celibate missionaries: "Considering," said this correspondent, "that it was *made in 1836*, it is certainly a *most remarkable forecast*."

To prove that this was an error, I pointed out that *this identical "Project for Reviving Religion in Great Towns"* was imparted by Hurrell Froude to Newman in a letter dated 31 August, 1833. I added that many other supposed Newmanian originalities were traceable to Hurrell Froude.

I need not say that the Editor made no reply to this; for there was no reply to make, except a confession of error.

§ 8. *An Appeal from the Editor of the "Spectator" to
Mr. R. H. Hutton*

7. In answer to my assertion that Newman's religion was a religion of fear—by which, of course, I meant that fear unduly predominated—the Editor thought it sufficient to refer to a single passage in Newman's poem "Gerontius," expressive of the love felt by the soul *after death* for the Saviour. I replied that single passages proved little; that this particular passage proved nothing about the state of feeling *during life*; but that, if a single passage could be of value, the following seemed to be to the point ("Gerontius," *Poems*, p. 341):—

" Along my earthly life, the thought of death
And judgment was to me most terrible;
I had it aye before me, and I saw
The Judge severe, *d'en in the Crucifix*."

What did the Editor reply to this? He thought it sufficient to quote another single passage in which Newman says that the "vision of faith" is compatible with anxiety about failing and with a host of other feelings, concluding with these words, "We can *weep while we smile*, and labour while we meditate."

How is this to the point? The question is whether the *constant*, ("aye before me") "*terrible thought of death and judgment*," is compatible with a religion of Christian joy; and whether he can be described as "rejoicing in the Lord alway" who cannot even contemplate Christ upon the Cross without always thinking of "the Judge severe." In answer to this question Mr. Hutton puts us off with a statement that we can "*weep while we smile*." Perhaps. But that is not the question. "*Terrible*" implies "*terror*." The question therefore is, whether Christian *love* is compatible with *unremitting "terror"*.

Here I appeal. From the Editor of the *Spectator* I appeal to Mr. R. H. Hutton, the author of *Cardinal Newman*, pp. 183-4, where Mr. Hutton comments upon a passage which I have selected as an admirable instance of Newmanian "Oscillation" (see *Philomythus*, p. 224). In this passage Newman desires to prove that love—instead of being (as is generally supposed) the basis of Christian faith—is only a kind of *Preservative* (in 1878 altered into "Conservative") *addition to fear*. How he achieves this feat I have tried elsewhere to explain; but let the reader note Mr. Hutton's comment, which I adopt: "Surely it degrades

love to speak of it as a mere '*preservative addition*' to a *Gospel of fear*."

That is just what I say. Only I would omit "surely" because, oddly enough, that word sometimes implies the possibility of a shade of doubt. And I should word it otherwise. Mr. Hutton seems to think that this deliberate expression of Newman's opinion is only a kind of impersonal excrescence, and says "*It degrades*." On the contrary, Newman's whole Anglican life and Anglican teaching are permeated with this belief. It is a part of his inmost self; and there is not the slightest ground for supposing that he did not in all sincerity mean what he said. So I, while agreeing with Mr. R. H. Hutton, should express my agreement with just a shade of difference, thus: "Newman habitually and deliberately degrades love by speaking of it, and thinking of it, as a mere '*preservative*' (or '*conservative*') *addition to a Gospel of fear*." And this, and nothing else, is what I meant by asserting that Newman's religion was "a religion of fear."

This is a very important point indeed, a point so important, that, in comparison with it, everything else that I have said, or thought of saying, about Cardinal Newman sinks into absolute insignificance. It is therefore a satisfaction that on this point I am in accord with Mr. R. H. Hutton the author—though, of course, not with the Editor of the *Spectator*.

§ 9. *Mr. R. H. Hutton's "Cardinal Newman"*

I now proceed to notice a few points in Mr. R. H. Hutton's *Cardinal Newman*, which require correction.

8. As I shall have to show that in most of his errors Mr. Hutton errs on the side of partiality for Newman, it seems fair to mention the only instance in which he errs on the side of injustice. It is where he says (p. 10) "Hurrell Froude *and he* chose at Rome a motto for the *Lyra Apostolica*." Newman makes a careful distinction: "*We borrowed a Homer . . . and Froude chose.*" The motto was the well-known Achillean boast, "You shall know the difference, now that I am back again;" and this was to be prefixed to a volume of Christian poetry, sheltering itself (in its title) under a dedication to the Apostles! Newman originated many mistakes, perhaps; but this one, at all events, he did not originate.

9. For the rest, Mr. Hutton's main fault is that he is taken in by Newman's plausible style. He is the victim of those rhetorical arts which I have described as "Oscillation," "Lubrication," and "Assimilation." So completely does he identify himself with some of Newman's most fallacious statements and most baseless conclusions, that I cannot blame any one of his readers for being, at least for a time, imposed upon by what, at the first reading, completely imposed upon me. But let anyone read Mr. Hutton's extracts two or three times over; let him write them out (an excellent habit! one of the best habits for

which I am indebted to Newman's teaching!) at least once; then let him take them to pieces, putting nouns for pronouns where necessary, carefully supplying latent assumptions, and noting any shifting use of words—and in almost all of them it will be found that what seemed a safe fabric of smoothly cogent logic bursts like the merest bubble of a hollow rhetoric. All these errors (without mentioning Mr. Hutton's name) I have exposed in *Philomythus* and, of course, shall not detail here.

10. The following passage in Mr. Hutton's *Life* seems to demand careful consideration. It concerns a letter written by Newman to his bishop in 1842, in which the former met the complaint that he "was erecting an Anglo-Catholic monastery at Littlemore, and that the *cells, chapel, dormitories* belonging thereto, were all advancing rapidly to completion. This," continues Mr. Hutton, from whom I am quoting, "was in 1842 before Newman had resigned the vicarage of St. Mary's. . . . Newman merely said that he was building a *parsonage* for Littlemore, which it much needed, without a *chapel*. . . . and that so far as regarded like-minded friends, he was, of course, glad that they should share his mode of life if they wished, but that no *sort of institution of any kind* was in process of formation. 'I am attempting nothing *ecclesiastical*,' he said, 'but something personal and private.'"

Mr. Hutton here correctly represents Newman's reply. Newman also added, "Your Lordship will perceive from what I have said that *no 'monastery* is in process of erec-

tion ;' there is no 'chapel,' no 'refectory,' hardly a dining-room or parlour. The 'cloisters' are my shed connecting the cottages. I do not understand what 'cells or dormitories' means."

Now in commenting upon the tone of this letter which Newman writes in a spirit of offended dignity—as if he should ever for a moment have contemplated a 'monastery,' or a 'chapel,' or 'cloisters,' and were absolutely unable to understand the imputation of 'cells'!—I think Mr. Hutton ought to have inserted, in justification of the popular suspicion, Newman's own admission (*Apologia*, p. 131), that in 1840 "he had in view a *monastic house*." And to future commentators I would commend the Letter of 20 May 1840, in which Newman speaks of 'the cells to be added as required,' 'the oratory, or chapel, a matter of future consideration,' and proposes to have "the cells upon a cloister, as at Magdalen." There is no ground (as I shall show in its proper place) for imputing to Newman conscious insincerity in this matter ; but there appears to be ground for understanding why ordinary English people suspected him, and why he ought not to have been altogether surprised that he was suspected.

11. Mr. Hutton is a little too fond of the language of eulogy in subjects on which it is difficult to eulogize well without a good deal of knowledge. He speaks of Newman's *Arians* as a "careful and scholarly book." I do not know enough about the book to say it is not ; but I have heard from good judges that it is undeserving of these

praises. Mr. T. Mozley indicates that, at the time of the publication of the *Arians*, the judgment of the ablest critics was unfavourable. As regards more recent opinion, on turning to *Studies of Arianism*, by H. M. Gwatkin, Cambridge, 1882, I find, at the end of a long list of some fifty authorities, the following significant note (Preface, p. xix) :—
“The above will all be found more or less useful to the student. Of Newman’s *Arians of the Fourth Century* let it suffice to say that his theories have always been scrupulously examined ; so that if they have not often been accepted, it is only because there is good reason for rejecting them.”

From the way in which Newman spent too many of his vacations, and this, too, long after he ought to have cast away the dissipating and wasteful impulses of youth—putting off what he ought to have done and could have done well, in order to begin to do what he must do, if at all, badly ; now studying Hebrew, and aspiring to Chaldee and Syriac, but finding his actual goal somewhere near the end of Genesis ; now thinking about German ; now getting up a smattering of some mathematical treatise that a well-educated boy would have mastered before he was fifteen ; now “reading various things” when he ought to have been preparing for the work of an Examiner in the Schools ; delaying from year to year that “reading of the Fathers” which he had so early set himself to accomplish ; constantly (during his early manhood) “fagged,” and “fussed,” and “in a stew ;” and, during almost every long vacation, breaking down more or less under the strain of too much work

undertaken with too little deliberation—I should be predisposed to believe that in his *Arians*, as in some other matters, he had attempted more than he could accomplish, and that he never accomplished anything well that depended, for its successful accomplishment, upon an exact knowledge of a large subject. In any case, Mr. Hutton should not say that *Arians* was “finished in July 1832;” it was altered, and apparently altered a good deal, in the autumn of 1833.

12. Mr. Hutton thinks that Newman’s *Essay on Development* “is marked by the keenest penetration into one of the most characteristic conceptions of modern science;” in his judgment, “it betrays so deep an insight into the generating thoughts which are transforming the present and moulding the future;” and his marvel at this prophetic sagacity is increased by the fact of its early date, since it “was written in 1844 and 1845” (*Cardinal Newman*, p. 165).

I shall have more to say, in a later section, about this, as it appears to me, blindly exaggerated praise of a treatise which, so far as I have studied it, appears to me to be pre-eminent, among all books of the kind known to me, in deserving the title of pseudo-scientific. Meantime let me say that the attempt to increase the reader’s sense of the sagacity of the forecasting element in this treatise by calling attention to the early date, contains a slight error. There is good evidence to show that the *Essay*, though conceived towards the end of 1844, was not written till 1845.

§ 10. *The Kingsleyan Controversy.*

13. “‘It must have taken great *gallantry* and *courage*,’ says Mr. Hutton (pp. 118, 119) to speak “in an Oxford pulpit at that day (*i.e.*, in Feb. 1843, six months before Newman resigned St. Mary’s), as follows :—

“If the truth must be spoken, what are the humble monk and the holy nun, and other regulars, as they were called, but Christians *after the very pattern given us in Scripture?* . . . Did our Saviour come on earth suddenly, as He will one day visit it, *in whom would He see the features of the Christians, whom He and His Apostles left behind them, BUT IN THEM?*’ ”

This is one of the passages which Newman employed to spatter what he called “blots” on Kingsley. His straightforward, English-minded adversary actually thought it strange that a clergyman of the Church of England should use such language! And certainly, since Newman himself held “*all along*”—and therefore on 5 (or 12) Feb. 1843, the date of this sermon—that no one “*could*”—*i.e.* “ought to”—remain “*in office* in the English Church, whether Bishop or *Incumbent*”—and therefore in the pulpit of St. Mary’s, Oxford—unless he were “*in hostility to the Church of Rome*,” it must be confessed that one would suppose Newman himself would be hard put to it to justify the passage above quoted. Two or three months afterwards (May 1843) he asked himself the question, “Is not my present position a cruelty as well as *a treachery to the*

English Church?” If he had put that question to himself in February 1843 and answered it in the affirmative, who could have disputed it? Endeavouring to make the kindest answer, what could any man of honour have said to him except this, “Your own conscience must answer this question. We cannot decide it for you”?

Conscious, therefore, of the very critical and painful indecisions of his own mind; aware (at least to some extent) of the very natural suspicions which commonplace Englishmen entertained about him; and knowing that he had, in the January of that very year, published a “Retraction,” in which he had destroyed the last remnant of the basis upon which (on his own showing) he could consistently and honourably use the vantage-ground of the pulpit of St. Mary’s, would Newman himself have liked to hear the words “*gallant*” and “*courageous*” lavished upon these Romanizing utterances of a quasi-Anglican clergyman? Newman hated humbug and conventionality. It was an “infirmity” with him, he says, to be “rude” to those who paid him excessive deference. I take it that, in this matter, he might have found occasion for displaying his “infirmity.”

But what about Newman’s actual reply to Kingsley’s natural indignation? Unluckily Kingsley did not *quote* his opponent; he used a loosely-guarded expression which Newman had not employed. “This,” says Kingsley, “is his *definition*¹ of Christians.”

¹ I have no doubt that these italics are Newman’s. So far as I have inspected Kingsley’s pamphlet I have noticed no italics. Newman freely italicizes his opponent’s words. I should not blame him, if he had give

Newman, of course, beats up his guard at once :—" This is not the case. I have neither given a definition, nor implied one, nor intended one. . . . He ought to know his logic better. I have said that 'monks and nuns find their pattern in Scripture,' he adds, '*Therefore*, I hold all Christians are monks and nuns.' This is Blot *one*. Now then for Blot *two*. 'Monks and nuns the *only* perfect Christians. . . . what more?' A second fault in logic. I said no more than that monks and nuns were perfect Christians ; he adds, '*therefore* monks and nuns are the *only* perfect Christians.' Monks and nuns are *not* the only perfect Christians : I never thought so, or said so, now or at any other time."

And such stuff as this went down with the discerning public of 1864!! I have heard that Kingsley was ill at the time. That perhaps, in part, explains the too one-sided result. Judgment, perhaps, went against him by default. I wish he had had a son who might have made answer for him in this and almost every point—except the charge of notice of his intention. I have done it myself, copying Newman, though with some misgiving. My present intention is to give up the habit, except in Newmanian controversies. At all events, whenever I have done it, *I have given notice of it.*

In my first letter to the *Spectator*, my notice about italics, given in the rough draft of my letter, was unfortunately cancelled in copying, and the Editor thought it necessary to warn its readers that "all, or almost all, the elaborate italics in Dr. Abbott's extracts from our article are his own and not ours." That was quite fair, as against me. But it was not kind, from a Newmanian, to Newman. I wonder what the Editor would say about Newman's "*manifold and elaborate italics*" in his quotations from Kingsley.

insincerity, which should have been absolutely disclaimed. It might have run thus :—

“ You have not fairly represented the meaning of your words, in asserting ‘ I said *no more than* that monks and nuns were perfect Christians.’ You went on to say, ‘ *In whom* would our Saviour see the features of the Christians, whom He and His Apostles left behind them, **BUT** in **THEM?**’ Now if a man says, ‘ Where would you find the book *but in* the bookcase?’ he means, or at all events ought naturally to be interpreted to mean, that the book would be found in the bookcase, and *nowhere else*.

“ For such a statement as this, you have prepared the way by saying that monks and nuns are Christians ‘ *after the very pattern* given in Scripture’—which is slightly different from the version given by you in inverted commas, ‘ I have said that “ monks and nuns *find their pattern* in Scripture.” ’ But you have done more than imply it ; you have *actually said it* in your second clause : ‘ *Where but in them* would our Saviour find, &c.,’ which ought, if it is to be strictly pressed, to be interpreted as meaning that our Saviour would see the ‘ features, &c.’ in the monk and nun *and nowhere else*. You say you ‘ never *thought so*.’ Granted. But you *said so*. And my business is with what you said, not with what you thought ! ”

Now it was not at all necessary that Mr. Hutton should have revived the Kingsleyan controversy. But to revive it in this way ; to take one of the very quotations on which Kingsley based his case ; to give, without comment, the

very words which showed that Kingsley was substantially right in this particular point ; to omit the natural deduction from these words ; and to describe the whole passage as indicating "*gallantry and courage*" in Newman, evinces a misappreciation of justice so very remarkable, that I know no single epithet whereby to characterize it, except—"Newmanian."

13. Mr. Hutton then refers, at some length (pp. 121, 122), to the Sermon on Wisdom and Innocence (19 February, 1843) which called forth Kingsley's wrath by this, among other passages in the Sermon :—"What, for instance, though we grant that *sacramental confession* and the *celibacy of the clergy* do tend to consolidate the body politic in the relation of rulers and subjects, or, in other words, to aggrandize the priesthood? For how can the Church be one body without such relation?"

Now here Newman made very merry with Kingsley's indignation at the possible effects of such language upon "hot-headed" young men, and scoffed at him in the second person with what will seem (I think) to many of my readers more than "a spice of insolence" :—"Hot-headed young men! Why, *man*, you are *writing a Romance*. You think the scene is Alexandria or the Spanish Main, where you may let your imagination *revel to the extent of inveracity*. It is good luck for me that the scene of my labours was not at Moscow or Damascus. Then I might be one of your ecclesiastical Saints, of which I sometimes hear in conversation, but with whom I am glad to say I have no

personal acquaintance. Then you might ascribe to me a more deadly craft than mere quibbling and lying ; in Spain I should have been an inquisitor, with my rack in the background ; I should have had a concealed dagger in Sicily ; at Venice I should have” And this stuff continues for half a page more ! And he rates Kingsley soundly for not knowing that, from the year 1841, Pusey and he had given up their theological *soirées* ! As though, by cutting off his tea-parties, a preacher *ipso facto* excludes Oxford undergraduates from St. Mary’s Church !! And this is “Blot *twelve*” against Kingsley ! Surely this “blot,” at least, missed its mark.

Here is another unfairness, in connection with the same passage. Newman urges in his behalf that “the sentence in question about Celibacy and Confession of which this writer would make so much, *was not preached at all.*” The sermon was published, he says, *after he had given up St. Mary’s* ; and therefore he claimed the right not “to restrain the expression of *anything that*” he “*might hold.*”

“Good,” we reply, “if you give *adequate notice to your readers.* Become a Romanist, a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, anything if you like ; we do not ask you to restrain the expression of ‘*anything that you might hold.*’ Only do not publish a volume under false colours as a volume of Anglican sermons.”

It may be urged, “He *was* an Anglican, at the time of publication ;” and indeed he expressly declares that he *did* publish it *while an Anglican* (*Apol.* p. 310), “written,

preached, and *published while I was an Anglican.*" Yes, he was practically an Anglican in Lay Communion ; but Anglicans who are in Lay Communion do not usually publish volumes of Anglican Sermons without giving ample notice to their readers that they are laymen and not clergymen.

But Newman retorts that he *did* give ample notice to guard the reader against mistaking this for a part of the actually uttered sermon. "In preparing," he says, "for publication, *a few words and sentences* have in several places been *added*, which will be found to express more of *private or personal opinion*, than it was expedient to introduce into the *instruction* delivered in Church to a parochial congregation." And he continues thus :—

"This volume of Sermons then cannot be criticised at all as *preachments* ; they are *essays* ; essays of a man who, at the time of publishing them, was *not* a preacher. Such passages as that in question, are *just the very ones* which I added upon my publishing them. I always was *on my guard in the pulpit against saying anything which looked towards Rome.*"¹

"*Habemus confitentem reum,*" Kingsley might justly have retorted. "What were '*just the very*' passages which you added *in publishing* ? By your own confession, passages that you were *on your guard against in the pulpit*, because they

¹ I presume it is with reference to these sermons that Newman writes to James Mozley (24 Nov. 1843), "I am now publishing sermons which speak more confidently about our position than I inwardly feel ; but I think it right and do not care for seeming inconsistent."

'*looked towards Rome.*' And this was one of them. This therefore '*looked towards Rome.*' And you published it *while still an Anglican*, and as an Anglican sermon, being still—nominally and legally at all events—a clergyman of the Church of England. So it came to this, that, while you were still an Anglican, you inserted in a volume of Anglican sermons a Romanizing passage—or, if you prefer it, a passage that '*looked towards Rome,*' without any notice, even that of brackets or footnotes, to your innocent reader ; and then, *after misleading me and your readers at large* into the belief that you abused your pulpit for Romanizing purposes, you actually turn round upon *me* as though *I* had done *you* a wrong ; and you suppose that you have justified yourself by saying, 'Therefore all his rhetoric, &c., becomes simple rubbish.'"

Once more, how does this defence of Newman's, as to this *second* passage about Celibacy and Confession, harmonize with his defence of the *first* passage as to "the humble monk and holy nun" ?

As to the *second*, he pleads that he *could not have preached it*. Why? Because it "*looked towards Rome.*" "Then," Kingsley might have replied, "what about the *first*? Did not your eulogy of *the monk and nun* '*look towards Rome*'? According to your own account therefore you ought not to have preached *that*. But you admit by implication, that you *did* preach *that*. This surely is a *blot* against you. And then, having done what you ought not to have done *once*, you turn round upon me because I

inferred from what appeared to be excellent additional evidence, that you have done what you ought not to have done *twice*."

Before passing to my next point, I should like to offer a suggestion to Newman's true friends, for adoption in future editions of the *Apologia*. If I turn over the introductory extracts of that work, on the very first line is "my Accuser"; on the last page are the words "a liar and a knave." I look at the Appendices, and I see the words "lying and equivocation" and similar unpleasant terms scattered about the pages. Ought this to be, *in a reprint of 1890*? Can we not, *by this time*, read the *Apologia* as a permanent and interesting addition to English literature, without having obtruded upon us the painful recollections of a serious mistake made by a good, honest, and noble-minded man, whose error, grave though it was, might at least be deemed to be somewhat extenuated by the quite exceptional circumstances and quite exceptional character which had roused a not absolutely unjustifiable suspicion in the minds of many others besides Kingsley?

It was right that Kingsley should be punished. It was perhaps fair that he should be spattered with "blots"; though a good many of the "blots," in strict fairness, ought to count not against Kingsley but against Newman himself. For so serious an offence, Kingsley himself perhaps would hardly complain if his antagonist tried to put him in the pillory. But he ought not to have been kept there. The substitution of "my Accuser" for "Mr. Kingsley" has not been enough.

It does not suffice to take down the name, and keep the victim still in his place of torture. The "blots" have been cancelled by Newman—wisely, I think, for the sake of his own reputation; but the pillory ought to go too. Six and twenty years of pillory are too much!¹

So much for the Kingsleyan controversy. I should not in the least have blamed Mr. Hutton for passing over all reference to it. But, since he did refer to it, I think he would have done well to call attention to the fact that Newman sometimes subjects his readers to very grave inconvenience by introducing into his text alterations of which he gives inadequate notice. I contend that Kingsley, in the present instance, fell into a pit that was carelessly (though not intentionally) left open by Newman; and that instead of being told that his remarks on the point were "simple rubbish," he was entitled to some kind of apology for the misunderstanding caused by Newman himself.

Though Mr. Hutton may not agree with me here, he will agree with me, I think, as to the next Newmanian pitfall

¹ They are *not* "too much" however apparently in the estimation of some Newmanians. While revising this proof, I have received an obscure journal—whose name I will not advertise by mention—which exults over Kingsley as "*gibbeted for all time* by the Master whom he had roused."

If this sort of language were to become common, it might be worth while considering whether an effective pamphlet might not be written entitled "Dr. Newman's Blots," or "Judgment Reversed," or "De sera Numinis vindicta"—such a pamphlet as a son of Kingsley's might have written, years ago, if he had been of age to write it. But I think Newman's best friends would do well to avoid such a contingency.

that I shall mention ; for he has fallen into it himself, and a very serious fall it is too, though I do not so much blame Mr. Hutton as Newman. Here it is :—

§ 11. *Mr. Hutton not much to blame*

14. The pitfall that I mean is this. Newman alters, and sometimes even recasts, his books, without giving his readers sufficient notice. In an article which I wrote in the *Contemporary*, when I had given comparatively little attention to the subject, I mentioned an interesting instance of this. Mr. Hutton (*Life*, p. 17), quotes a passage from the *Apologia*, in which Newman says that he had tried in various ways to make “the doctrine of eternal punishments” “less terrible to *the reason*.” I pointed out to Mr. Hutton that, in the present text of the *Apologia*, “imagination” had been substituted for “reason” ; to which he replied that he did not think the change an improvement. That seemed to me odd. For though I find myself in constant disagreement with Newman I nevertheless always pay him the tribute of believing that he means precisely what he says, and that, if he alters what he says, it is because he has some good reason for it, and has altered what he means. I will not now enter into the meaning of the alteration here, which I have endeavoured to explain in the *Contemporary*. But the point on which I lay stress is this, that in a future edition of his work, Mr. Hutton should compare the later editions of Newman’s works with the earlier.

The most curious instance of the need of such compari-

son is to be found in the *Development of Christian Doctrine*. Mr. R. H. Hutton, while lauding its "deep insight," "admirable subtlety," and "keen penetration," appears to be ignorant that Newman was not quite so well satisfied with it as his eulogist was. The fact is that Newman thought so ill of some portions of it that he afterwards entirely rewrote them. Consequently when Mr. Hutton speaks (p. 180) of "logical sequence" as being the "fifth test of development," he ought, according to the later edition, to have written "fourth;" and as for what he says in detail about this "logical sequence," the reader will see at once that Mr. Hutton's remarks are absolutely out of place, except for those rare readers who happen to possess the first edition of the Essay.¹ Here are the differences between Newman's first and last editions (1845 and 1890), in the sections on "Logical Sequence" :—

First Edition (1845).

CHAPTER VIII.

1. Developments growing out of the Question of our Lord's Divinity.
2. Developments following on the Doctrine of Baptism.

Last Edition (1890).

CHAPTER IX.

1. Pardons.
2. Penances.
3. Satisfactions.
4. Purgatory.
5. Meritorious Works.
6. The Monastic Rule.

Indeed, if the reader were to compare the "Contents" of the two editions, he would hardly recognize that he had

¹ I quote from Mr. Hutton's first edition of *Cardinal Newman*. His second edition, which, while writing, I have just seen advertised, probably contains this passage re-written. At all events I suggested to him, six months ago, the propriety of re-writing it.

before him two editions of the same Essay, but would suppose (though wrongly) that the whole of the treatise had been re-written. As a matter of fact, the treatise has not been re-written ; but chapters, sections, and paragraphs have been so twisted about, paragraphs here and there have been in such a way re-written, or omitted, or inserted, that the first edition, for the purposes of reference, is absolutely useless to the possessors of the last.

This is the more unpardonable in Newman because he retains in the reprint of 1890 (without adding anything to neutralize its effect), the statement that his offer to revise the work in the interests of the Church of Rome was declined by the Ecclesiastical authorities "on the ground that it was written and partly printed before he was a Catholic, and that it would come before the reader in a more persuasive form, *if he read it as the author wrote it.*" Now it is quite true that the Preface to the last edition states that "various important alterations have been made in the arrangement of its separate parts, and some indeed, not in the matter, but in the text." But a mere glance at the two editions will show that the "matter," as well as the "text," has been in many instances altered, and that, too, in a Romanizing, or anti-Protestant, or generally aggressive direction. Here are two instances :—

1845.

P. 370.

"I will direct attention to a characteristic principle of Christianity, which may almost be con-

1890.

P. 401.

"I will direct attention to a characteristic principle of Christianity, [*whether in the East or the*

sidered as a modification or instance of the great Sacramental Principle on which I have lately insisted; I mean the view which Christianity takes of Matter as susceptible of grace, or as capable of a union with a Divine Presence and influence. This principle, as we shall see," &c.

West, which is at present both a special stumbling-block and a subject of scoffing with Protestants and free-thinkers of every shade and colour; I mean the devotion which both Greeks and Latins show towards bones, blood, the heart, the hair, bits of clothes, scapulars, cords, medals, beads, and the like, and the miraculous powers which they often ascribe to them. Now the principle from which these beliefs and usages proceed is the doctrine] that Matter is susceptible of grace, or capable of a union with a Divine Presence and influence. This principle, as we shall see," &c.

1845.

P. 412.

"Evidently then the position of Baptism in the received system was not the same in the first ages as in later times; and still less was it clearly ascertained in the first three centuries. The problem which required an answer was. . . Since there was but one Baptism, what could be done for those who had received the one remission of sins, and had sinned since? *The primitive Fathers appear to have conceived, &c.*"

1890.

P. 384.

"*It is not necessary here to enlarge on the benefits which the primitive Church held to be conveyed to the soul by means of the Sacrament of Baptism. . . .* The question immediately followed, how, since there was but 'one Baptism for the remission of sins,' the guilt of such sin was to be removed as was incurred after its administration. *There must be some provision in the revealed system for so obvious a need.* What could be done for those who had received the one remission of sins, and had sinned since? *Some who thought upon the subject appear to have conceived, &c.*"

E 2

These are enough, I think, to show the unlucky possessor of the *last* edition, or even the 1878 edition, of Newman's Essay, that he does *not* possess it in that "*more persuasive form*" in which the authorities of the Church of Rome desired that it should appeal to the Protestant enquirer. Whoever wants to know precisely what Newman thought about "the Primitive Fathers" and "the position of Baptism in the received system," and other important matters in that interesting crisis of 1845, when he was supplying himself with a logical basis for entering the Roman pale, must go, not to the edition of 1890, or 1878, but to the first edition and no other. And I commend the reprinting of *that* edition to the favourable consideration of those who were recently thinking of collecting a fund for the encouragement of the study of Newman's works.

Now, Mr. R. H. Hutton, in his *Cardinal Newman*—misled by Newman's remark in the *Apologia* (1864), "the book remains *in the state in which it was then, unfinished*," and ignorant of the fact that it was wholly rearranged, and in parts re-written, in 1878—devotes a page (162-3) to the expression of his surprise that Newman should not have "pursued and completed" the line of thought traced out in his unfinished work, so as to make it "a definite apology for the theology of the Church he has since joined." I do not say he is *literally* in error here; but he certainly misleads his readers. And he is definitely—or at least subjectively—wrong, I presume, when he adds: "*Even as it stands, the Essay on Development*

has, so far as I can hear, been adopted with enthusiasm by the most orthodox school in the Roman Catholic Church."

Not, surely, "as it *stands*" in the edition from *which Mr. Hutton quotes in his text, and to which he refers in his footnote!* Not to the edition which speaks with such an Anglican looseness about "the Primitive Fathers" as having apparently made a misconception; and about "the position of Baptism" as "not the same in the first ages as in later times!" Not, in a word, to that edition in which we can read it "*as the author wrote it,*" but rather to that later and more popular edition, which—having been revised thirty-four years after the date of composition in the interests of the Church of Rome—substitutes "some people" for "the Fathers" in the awkward phrase above quoted; cancels every hesitating phrase about "the position of Baptism"; and enlarges with a truly Roman frankness upon these "devotions" to "bones, blood, the heart, the hair, bits of clothes, &c.," which—we must confess it—present "a special stumbling-block" to us misguided Protestants!!

Now, if Newman was entitled to be rude to Kingsley and to say that his note about "a few words and sentences" "stared him in the face," might he not have said with even more cogency that the notice about "the important changes," above-mentioned, "stared Mr. Hutton in the face" and ought to have prevented him from ignoring them? For my part, I think Newman would have no right thus to censure Mr. Hutton; but then, for the same

reason, I think he had no right—in the particular instance above-mentioned—to censure Kingsley, and I call upon Mr. Hutton to think so too.

Mr. Ward, in his last letter to the *Spectator*, takes advantage of my admission that I have only “partially examined Newman’s” religious writings (by which I specially meant his sermons), to infer that I have read my own preconception into such books of Newman’s as I have looked at. I deny the inference; but I admit the charge, which, to me, seems a praise. I am guiltless of the offence of having devoted *five-and-twenty years* to the study of Newman; but I have spared no pains, while reading any work of his, to ascertain exactly what he meant to say, and if he altered his words, then to ascertain how, and why, he altered them. The author of *Cardinal Newman* cannot be congratulated on having been equally painstaking.

I must admit, however, that the task of a sympathetic biographer is made very much more complex and laborious when one has to compare edition with edition and text with text in this minute way. And I am glad to conclude my somewhat incriminatory review of Mr. Hutton’s sympathetic and interesting though not very penetrative sketch, by pointing out after many more or less culpable errors, one, at last, for which he is not much to blame.

§ 12. *Polemical Theology*

At this stage of the controversy a weariness sets in. An indescribable feeling of disgust, partly with others, partly

with circumstances, partly with myself, comes creeping over me, and brings with it a half-wish to cancel all that I have written, and to cast Mr. Hutton and Mr. Ward (metaphorically) to the winds, leaving my sincerity, my honesty, and my attempts (inadequate I know) at accurate criticism, to take care of themselves. I hate all this cut-and-thrust gladiatorial exhibition, not because I am afraid of Nisus and Euryalus combined, for I flatter myself that my retiarian tactics are sufficient for two such heavy-armed antagonists in their fullest panoply. But I do not want to fight—with them. I want to fight outside the amphitheatre, not for fun, but in earnest; not as a Retiarus but as a soldier. Truth is worth fighting for: but am I fighting for it? Am I not wasting my time upon a mere ephemeral sport?

What has bewitched me, I ask, that, so late in life, I should take to controversy? For thirty years, ever since I began to teach, I have sought peace and ensued it, and have gone on the principle that the best way to exterminate error is to plant truth. And now!

Whence this change? Can it be that much recent study of the Tractarian Movement has infected me with that contentious spirit which made Froude choose the Homeric motto above-mentioned, and induced Newman, during the early days of his campaign against the Liberals in 1833, to exclaim twenty times a day, "We'll *do them*"? Can I deny that it *is* my desire to "*do*" Mr. Hutton and Mr. Ward? and ought I not to be ashamed of it?

An incident, almost forgotten, recurs suggestively to my mind in connection with the attack upon me made by Mr. Wilfrid Ward, who is justly proud of being the son of Mr. W. G. Ward, commonly known as "ideal" Ward. When I was once in St. Mary's, Oxford, sitting by the side of Dean Stanley and listening to an episcopal sermon which dealt heavy blows at the Church party to which the preacher was opposed, the Dean kept turning round and "nudging" me every now and then, at any particularly effective stroke of pungent rhetoric. My feelings were mixed. At first I was uneasy, and looked round to see whether people took notice. But no one did. It seemed to be the regular thing. There was also a kind of historic interest for me in the fact that I, Select Preacher for the afternoon, listening to the Episcopal Preacher of the morning, in St. Mary's, Oxford, should be nudged by a Dean of Westminster. But now, reading of late, in the life of Mr. W. G. Ward, how, nearly sixty years ago, he used to "nudge" young Mr. A. P. Stanley while the two sat side by side in St. Mary's, listening to Newman's doctrine, the thought suggests itself, Can it be that I, a quiet Cambridge man, under the guise of an honourable invitation from the Sister University, was inveigled into Oxonian meshes and there and then infected with the spirit of polemical theology derived through Stanley from Mr. W. G. Ward by the imposition of hands? I feel disposed to fling controversy to the winds.

Shall I then suppress my Preface? It requires considera-

tion. In order to steady my mind I take down Wordsworth's *Preludes*. This is my constant antidote when I feel poisoned with over-much Newmanianism. I have often had of late much the same feeling that was recently expressed to me by a distinguished man of science,—a keen logician, and second to no living man in his unflinching recognition of veracities—in a letter in which he expressed his opinion of my book : “ I read Newman's *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles* with a good deal of care some time ago ; and I came to the conclusion that it was one of the most intellectually demoralizing books I have ever met with. After two or three hours of it, my reasoning faculties seemed to become ‘unclean till the even.’ It was needful to go wash in a scientific treatise and recover the perception of the difference between truth and falsehood.”

That curiously coincides with my own feeling and my own habit. Only I have been used to “go wash,” not in a scientific treatise, but in poetry, and especially in the pure streams of the poem I mentioned above ; which accordingly I now take down and open. I light upon a passage describing Wordsworth's rooms in St. John's, a favourite, because of the Wordsworthian transition from the commonplace opening to the calm grandeur of the conclusion :

“ The Evangelist St. John my patron was :
Three Gothic courts are his, and in the first
Was my abiding-place, a nook obscure ;
Right underneath, the College kitchens made
A humming sound, less tunable than bees,
But hardly less industrious ; with shrill notes

Of sharp command and scolding intermixed.
Near me hung Trinity's loquacious clock,

* * * *

Her pealing organ was my neighbour too ;
And from my pillow, looking forth by light
Of moon or favouring stars, I could behold
The antechapel where the statue stood
Of Newton with his prism and silent face,
The marble index of a mind for ever
Voyaging through strange seas of Thought, alone."

This calms and abashes me. This forces me to look facts in the face and to judge myself severely. Am I not, I ask myself, preferring to stop down below and scuffle in the kitchens, when I might be, perhaps, in the student's upper chamber, striving to catch some glimpse of the profound laws of the Eternal Order of things ?

What shall I do ? The waste-paper basket stands invitingly near. It has been a salutary haven for many of my productions : why not for this ?

§ 13. *The Origin of this Book*

Let me once more examine myself. The *Spectator* of 2nd May lies open before me containing an editorial rejoinder to my last letter : " If Dr. Abbott is not one of Cardinal Newman's worst enemies, Cardinal Newman must have had some very dangerous enemies indeed." Is it so indeed ? If I search my heart, can I honestly declare that I do not find there the least spark of personal enmity to Newman ? I think I can. I remember, when in the thick of the Tractarian literature, expressing to my most intimate

friend the intense fascination that the chief character in that drama was exercising over me, and protesting that I was getting to like him, and that I would not begin to write about him till I did like him. For I do not believe any man can write accurately about another for whom he does not feel some kind of liking. If, then, I do my very best, first, to ascertain the truth about Newman by patient labour and arrangement, and then to speak the truth about him with fairness and accuracy, is it *my* fault that I am accounted one of Newman's most "dangerous enemies"? Why do not my opponents convict me of serious error, if I am in error? But, if I am not, is it a friendly act to Newman himself to assert that I become his "enemy" because I speak the truth about him?

The same number of the *Spectator* inserts, immediately after its editorial rejoinder, a letter from a correspondent who thanks the Editor for his attack on me, and implies his regret "that Dr. Abbott did not assault Newman while he was alive, instead of after his death. We should have seen, I think, a grand repetition of the flaying of an assailant, as we saw it when Kingsley attacked."

I have no wish to complain of this criticism. The anticipation of it was present with me from the very first, when *Philomythus* first began to emerge—almost against the will of its author—from its originally destined condition of an Appendix, into a separate existence as an independent work. Instead of complaining, I will explain.

Seven or eight months ago I had no more notion than Mr. Ward himself could have had, of attacking Newman. I felt indeed that in the chorus of indiscriminate praise that went up after his death, there was some element of exaggeration. But what then? There will always be some kindly folk who parody the good old proverb *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, into *de mortuis nil nisi adulatorium*. But what was that to me? A friend of mine declared that, by a kind of tacit agreement, the notices of the recently deceased Cardinal had been intrusted to people who were all of his own way of thinking, and that the public were being blinded by "a sort of conspiracy." I did not quite take that view. Certainly, if there had been a conspiracy, I had no intention of resisting it.

I was at that time busy with other things. I had before me in proof a little popular book upon Illusions, which I was correcting for the press. In it I had called attention to what Bacon describes as the Illusions of the Cave, that is, those which spring from personal temperament and from exceptional training; and I had selected (without mentioning names) Cardinal Newman as one type, and Professor Huxley as another. At the time, I was much more interested in the latter of these. To the Professor I had assigned some forty or fifty lines; to the Cardinal, five or six at most. So far, then, I was innocent of all intentions of making any kind of serious attack upon Newman.

A mere chance brought about a change. I had written a lecture for Toynbee Hall which, when written, I found

too theological for the occasion. I had, at short notice, to deliver a spoken lecture in its place; and in this I drew a contrast (without mentioning persons by name) between Cardinal Newman and Professor Huxley, as illustrating Bacon's doctrine of the Idols or Illusions of the Cave. As ill luck would have it, the reporter, not unnaturally, I think, mistook some of my metaphorical statements for literal, and also omitted all the kind things I had said about Professor Huxley and touched up all the unkind. The consequence was that the Professor, finding himself described (not of course by name) in a leading article of a very influential journal as "an extremely disagreeable person," flamed into a not altogether unjustifiable wrath, which he curtly expressed in that journal's columns. I replied, vindicating my general position, and my right to use the Professor's autobiography for public purposes, but explaining the origin of the misunderstanding. I added that I had no more intention of treating him with disrespect than I should have had of so treating Cardinal Newman. Both he, and the Cardinal, I said, had done the public harm as well as good (as all eminent men must do); and both were likely to do more good, and less harm, if their several "idols," or illusions, were recognized. The Professor made a very courteous answer, gently hinting that I had a little overdone my case in some respects, but acknowledging that I was within my right as to the general position, and desiring to "cry quits" if he had been a trifle brusque; and so that controversy speedily reached an amicable termination.

But it had, for me, important consequences. As soon as this affair was off my hands, I sat down to continue the interrupted revision of my book. But it occurred to me that now, since I had publicly mentioned my antithesis between the Cardinal and the Professor, it would not do any longer to give the Professor fifty lines and the Cardinal only five. So I began to write a paragraph or two about Newman. It was long since I had read the *Apologia*; I looked it up again. The paragraphs grew into a section. I refreshed my memory by re-reading old notes I had made on the *Grammar of Assent*; the section grew beyond the limits of a section, and threatened to become long enough for an article in the *Contemporary*. Still I read on, and the more I read, the more my article expanded, till it became clear that what I published as an article could be no more than a chapter or two in a larger work dealing with the whole of Newman's Anglican career.

I now plunged into the Tractarian literature, and entered on the study, or re-study, of some of Newman's most important works. A spell was upon me compelling me, sorely against my will, to put on the shelf the book that I ought, before this, to have published, and to devote myself entirely to the examination of the interesting, the fascinating character of the man who originated the Oxford Movement. One of Newman's Oxford contemporaries (perhaps the most eminent of all, if Mr. Gladstone be excepted) recently wrote me a letter containing "six reasons why Newman was thought a great man." I was not quite

satisfied with them, though they suggested much ground for meditation; but what struck me more than anything else in his letter was that, at the end of it, as though he himself were dissatisfied with his own explanations, he interpolated this short sentence as a final reason: "He was a magnet." I felt this to be true. Newman was a magnet, and I was magnetized. I must go on reading and thinking, and giving up every other occupation till I had come to some solution of so strange a problem.

It was at this stage that I took up a work of Newman's which I had never even glanced at before, the *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*. Words, and temper, would fail me, if I attempted to describe briefly the bewildering amazement, at first, and the absolute horror, at last, with which I was affected by that book. I may have been wrong. We are all—like poor Nisus and Euryalus—liable to confuse our own restless and imperious *dira cupido* with the legitimately imperial voice of the *deus*, which all are bound to obey. To me, at all events, it seemed a *deus*. I felt almost irresistibly, and quite lawfully, impelled to protest with what force of logic and fact I could, against that Abomination of intellectual Desolation, entitled Newman's *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*, written in 1843, re-edited in 1870, and re-printed in the year of the Incarnate Truth, 1890. But I will call it no more names. What I think about it *Philomythus* shows; and from what I thought about it *Philomythus* sprang.

Will this egotism—the responsibility for which I lay upon

those who have forced me to it by imputing to me the most unworthy motives and the most disreputable conduct, and this, too, in a journal which professes to be a model of Christian propriety—suffice to convince even the most spell-bound and hypnotized Newmanian among my assailants, that, whether right or wrong, at all events I am in earnest, and have not, and never had, the least touch of any malignant desire to play wanton havoc with a dead man's reputation? It is not my fault that Newman is not alive. It is not my fault that I did not read his *Essay* twenty or thirty years ago. I always understood, till lately, that it was not worth reading. It was the reprinting of it in 1890; it was the proposal to establish a fund for the encouragement of the study of Newman's works in the same year; it was Mr. R. H. Hutton's laudation of passages from this book as "candid and reasonable"; it was Mr. Hutton's eulogy of Newman himself as a "very exact writer" (!)—that first led me to read it, and then absolutely goaded me to protest against it. The same things may make others read the book, and may make some believe in it. A man may be dead, but still exercise a pernicious influence. What said Newman himself while still an Anglican? "The spirit of Luther is dead, but Hildebrand and Loyola are alive."

These considerations appear to justify not only my book, but also the publication of this Preface. Perhaps it is a mistake to be too non-controversial and to follow peace with all men too much. The non-controversialist escapes trouble, and does not suffer; but the truth may suffer. And it

one speaks, one must speak out. Newman was right: "It does not do to be tame"—at all events when one can honestly say one does not *feel* "tame."

P.S. § 14. Mr. Hutton very much to blame

Since the greater part of what precedes was printed, I have procured and glanced at Mr. R. H. Hutton's second edition of *Cardinal Newman*; and I am amazed to find that not one of four errors of the first edition, which I pointed out to him in the course of last autumn, is corrected in the second. Here they are:—

1. (2nd ed. p. 152.) "Even as early as 1837, he [Newman] had received his first shock as to the tenability of the *Via Media*."

For 1837, read 1839. Mr. Hutton, when I indicated the error to him, told me that it was a misprint. But it was a misleading misprint for the ordinary reader, who, if he were to accept this date as correct, would have all his views of Newman's Anglican career changed. It was only slightly careless to let the misprint pass in the first edition; but what are we to call the retention of it in the second?

2. (ib. p. 176.) "Thus, as Newman quotes from the life of *St. Gregory of Nyssa*, that Saint 'increased the devotion of the people everywhere by instituting festive meetings, &c.'"

For "St. Gregory of Nyssa" read "St. Gregory Thaum-

turgus, written by St. Gregory of Nyssa ;” and for “that saint” read the “the former.”

3. (*ib.* p. 17.) Mr. Hutton still makes Newman say that he has “tried in various ways to make the doctrine of eternal punishment less terrible to the *reason*,” though Newman himself has altered “reason” into “imagination,” and though he would (it can hardly be doubted) altogether repudiate, as a mere Anglican slip, the language which made him imply that a truth of revelation should in any way be submitted, or made less terrible, to the “reason.” At least, Mr. Hutton should have given Newman’s later version in a footnote.

4. Mr. Hutton makes *no reference whatever* to those “important changes” in the latest edition of Newman’s *Essay on Development*, which have practically made the reprint of 1890 a different book from the edition of 1845 ; and he retains that page of misleading statements which in § 11 above I described “as not much to blame,” but which now—thus retained without a word of warning to the reader—must be characterized as decidedly blameworthy and—in a literary sense—scarcely creditable.

5. Another error of judgment—though not of fact—is that he still favours that unworthy legend which would make Newman so ignorant of the merits of his own work that he “consigned or doomed to the waste-paper basket,” a poem so sublime (in many parts) as *Gerontius*. Most improbable in itself, the story has been made still more improbable by Mr. A. W. Hutton in the *Expositor* of last year. If it were

true, it would not do honour to Newman ; and, in the face of Mr. A. W. Hutton's statements, it ought not to have been retained without some confirmatory evidence beyond saying that " Mr. Jennings credits the statement."

On finding that all the four errors first enumerated were still retained, my first impression was that this " second edition " was a printer's affair, not the author's, and that there were no corrections at all in it. But it is not so. Here are two corrections,¹ relating to Newman's collapse in the Schools at Oxford, and the causes of it. It will be seen that Mr. Hutton lays the blame on the failure of the banking firm of which Newman's father was a member.

Mr. Hutton's First Edition.

P. 16.

"The bank failed . . . and this-made it necessary for Newman to take his degree without *reading* for honours, at the earliest possible age."

Ib. p. 18.

"As I have said, *his name did not appear in the honours' list at all*, as his graduation was *hurried on in consequence of his father's failure*, which rendered it necessary," &c.

Mr. Hutton's Second Edition.

P. 16.

"The bank failed . . . and this made it necessary for Newman to take his degree without *preparing* for honours, at the earliest possible age."

Ib. p. 18.

"As I have said, he had not *prepared himself for honours at all* (though he received a third class *for the excellent character of his work*), his father's failure having rendered it necessary," &c.

Now Newman *did* " read for honours," and his name *did* appear in the honours' list ;" so that some correction of the first edition was undoubtedly necessary.

¹ There is also on p. 10 a correction of the error above noticed about the choice of the Homeric motto for the *Lyra Apostolica*.

But it is corrected wrongly. For the second edition tells us, first, that Newman had to "take his degree without *preparing for honours*," and then that he "had not prepared himself for honours *at all*." This is an absolute myth, a mere Newmanian legend. Newman "prepared himself" not only for honours, but *for honours in two Schools*, mathematics as well as classics; and though he was a little discursive in his reading at times, he laboured, on the whole, too hard. He himself tells us that, during the Long Vacation of 1819, he used to work nearly nine hours a day; that from thence to November 1820 it was "a continuous mass of reading;" and that during twenty out of the twenty-four weeks immediately preceding his examination, he "fagged" at an average of more than twelve hours a day. Newman protests to his father that he had "done everything to attain" his object, and that he had "spared no labour;" all who knew him based their anticipations that he would gain two first classes, in part upon their notions of the extreme "closeness of his application." So far therefore from not having prepared himself *at all*, he had *prepared himself too much*. He had, after his manner, overworked; and so, when the crisis came, he—again after his manner—broke down.

Perhaps Mr. Hutton might reply that his meaning was that Newman's extreme youth precluded him from "preparing" himself *adequately* "for honours." If that was meant, that should have been said. But how stand the facts? Newman was *three months short of twenty* when he took his degree;

Keble was just *eighteen* when he took his ; Newman read for two first classes and *failed to get either* ; Keble read for two first classes and *succeeded in getting both*. Now no one would venture to assert that, because Keble was only eighteen when he took his degree, he "*had not prepared himself for honours at all*." Why therefore does Mr. Hutton assert this about Newman, who took his degree when he was nearly two years older ? Simply because, whereas Keble succeeded, Newman failed ! The idolatry of Newmanianism cannot allow its devotees to acknowledge that any failure was, in large measure, the fault of the idol.

6. "He received a third class for the excellent character of his work."

I should like to know what Oxford men say to this. Newman himself says that his name in the classical honour list "was found in the lower division of the second class of honours, which at that time went by *the contemptuous title* of the 'under-the-line,' there being as yet no third or fourth classes." Now, was it really the Oxonian custom in those days to give the class known by this "contemptuous title" for "*the excellent character of a man's work*" ? I should have thought it was a kind of "scrape-through," given for deplorably bad work, which showed traces here and there of proceeding from an able and well-read man who, from accidental causes, had not done himself justice. Nothing short of an affidavit from the whole of the Hebdomadal Board will convince me that the Oxford men of those days rewarded "*the excellent character*" of a man's

work, as Mr. Hutton says they did, or that this is anything else but another myth of Newmanianism.

And now, what are we to say to such a "second edition" as this; which does not, even in an introduction, or an appendix, or a foot-note, acknowledge (much less correct) errors long ago pointed out to the author?

This business demands plain speaking. In the columns of the *Spectator* I have been charged with "unmannerly abuse" because I ventured to say that Newman's conduct on a particular occasion, though not really dictated by mercenary motives, was nevertheless "worthy of a bookseller's hack." I adhered, and adhere, to this charge, *as qualified by its context*. I now repeat it (provisionally and pending an explanation) against Mr. R. H. Hutton's second edition of *Cardinal Newman*. But I give him the same alternative as I gave in the former instance. I say that this is "inferior literary work"; but I do not, and cannot, believe that it is "inferior literary work *done for hire*," that is to say, to save a little trouble, and a few shillings for printer's corrections or for a paper of Corrigenda. The real explanation I honestly believe to be as follows, and I say it without a touch of irony. It is the result of the Newmanian "magnet." It is the inevitable consequence of a twenty-five years' loving and devoted study of Newman's works which has exercised upon the student—so far as concerns all

subjects directly or indirectly bearing upon Newman—a mental fascination, incapacitating him from accuracy of detail, paralysing his faculty of appreciating evidence, and rendering him blind or indifferent to all facts that do not subserve a purpose.

Braeside, Willow Road, N.W.

May 12, 1891.





